

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Webshington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/835,498 | 04/16/2001 | Ki Young Oh | P/2292-43 5377 | | |
| 2352 | 7590 12/11/2002 | | | | |
| OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403 | | SONG, MATTHEW J | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1765 | Q | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 12/11/2002 | /2002 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| • | | | | # >-8 | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | 1. 7 0 | | | | |
| | 09/835,498 | | OH ET AL. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Matth w J Song | | 1765 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Peri df r Reply | pears on the cover s | heet with the c | rrespondenc add | ress | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | 36(a). In no event, howeve y within the statutory minim will apply and will expire SIX . cause the application to be | r, may a reply be tim um of thirty (30) days ((6) MONTHS from t ecome ABANDONED | ely filed will be considered timely, the mailing date of this cort (35 U.S.C. § 133). | nmunication. | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | <u> </u> | | | | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b)□ Th | is action is non-fina | ıl. | | | | | | |
| Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims | ance except for fom Ex parte Quayle, 1 | nal matters, pr 935 C.D. 11, 4 | osecution as to the 53 O.G. 213. | e merits is | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application | ١. | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>5-11</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | r election requirem | ent. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce | pted or b)☐ objected | to by the Exar | miner. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to th | | | | | | | | |
| 11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on | | | ved by the Examine | er. | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in re | ply to this Office action | n. | | | | | | |
| 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | caminer. | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | n priority under 35 l | J.S.C. § 119(a |)-(d) or (f). | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority document | ts have been receiv | red. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority document | ts have been receiv | ed in Applicati | on No | | | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | ıreau (PCT Rule 17 | '.2(a)). | | Stage | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest | | | | application). | | | | |
| a) The translation of the foreign language pro | ovisional application | n has been rec | eived. | , | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | no priority under 55 | J.J.J. 33 120 | and or the | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | ′== | | y (PTO-413) Paper No(| | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | · == | Notice of Informal Other: | Patent Application (PT0 | D-152) | | | | |

Application/Contr

Art Unit: 1765

umber: 09/835,498

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivaramakrishnan et al (US 5,879,574) in view of Adams et al (US 5,085,887) and Nishizawa et al (US 6,464,793) and Tsuchimoto (US 3,916,034).

Sivaramakrishnan et al discloses a Chemical vapor deposition (CVD) apparatus includes a susceptor 25 installed inside the reactive chamber, a heater/lift assembly 30 and a remote microwave plasma system 55 to deposit plasma enhanced CVD films by inputting deposition reactive gases into system 55 via input line 57 (col 14, ln 20-25). Sivaramakrishnan et al also discloses for plasma processes the CVD apparatus will include a gas feed-through box housing gas passages 83, 85 to enable the application of high voltage RF power to the gas box (col 26, ln 40-45). Sivaramakrishnan et al also discloses a vacuum pump is activated to generate vacuum pressure within a pumping channel, thereby drawing the process gases and plasma residue out of the processing chamber through a exhaust port 361 (col 35, ln 33-37 and Fig 4 and 8), where the exhaust port reads on applicant's gas outlet. Sivaramakrishnan et al also discloses a process selector subroutine 153 identifies the desired set of process parameters needed to operate the process chamber, where the process parameters include process gas composition and flow rates, temperature, pressure, plasma composition and chamber wall temperature (Fig

1D and col 17, ln 20-35). Sivaramakrishnan et al discloses a process gas control subroutine 163 for controlling the process gas composition and flow rates, which reads on applicant's gas supply controller (col 18, ln 50-67) and heat control subroutine 167 for controlling the temperature (col 19, ln 58-67), which reads on applicant's temperature controller.

Sivaramakrishnan et al does not disclose a reactive chamber consisting of an upper container and a lower container junctioned by an O-ring.

In a reaction vessel apparatus for processing semiconductor wafers, Adams et al teaches a thermal reactor 10 is formed by a reactor vessel 10V, defining a wafer reactor chamber 10C with a wafer cover member 12 with a central window 12W and a O-ring 15B (Fig 1), where the region above the O-ring reads on applicant's upper container and the region below reads on applicant's lower chamber. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sivaramakrishnan et al with Adams' reactor vessel because the reactor vessel has a window portion suitable for both reduced pressure and ambient pressure applications (col 1, ln 60-67)

Sivaramakrishnan et al does not disclose at least two gas supply controllers respectively installed at the gas supply pipes to repeatedly supply the material gases alternately into the chamber.

In a semiconductor crystal growth apparatus, note entire reference, Nishizawa et al teaches a vessel 1 includes nozzles 4 and 5 for introducing gaseous compounds, where the nozzles 4 and 5 are provided with on-off valves 6 and 7 for controlling the introduced ammounds of gaseous compounds. Nishizawa et al also teaches a control unit 18 controls the opening and closing of the valves 6 and 7 for alternately and repeatedly introducing

gases (col 4-5 and Fig 3). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sivaramakrishnan et al with Nishizawa et al to grow an epitaxial layer having a desired thickness can be attained with precision as precise as a single molecular layer (col 4, ln 60-67) and to prevent undesired reactions between two or more source gases.

Sivaramakrishnan et al does not disclose at least two remote plasma generators installed outside the reactive chamber.

In a method of transporting plasma to a substrate to grow a single crystal of material on a substrate, note entire reference, Tsuchimoto teaches two or more selected materials are turned into separate ionized plasmas in separate plasma generating chambers 1a and 1b (Abstract and Embodiment 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sivarmakrishnan et al with Tsuchimoto because a plurality of materials, which cannot coexist in a single plasma generator can be separately turned into the corresponding plasma (col 9, ln 1-67).

Referring to claim 3, the combination of Sivaramakrishnan et al, Adams et al, Nishizawa et al, and Tsuchimoto teaches a heater/lift assembly 30.

Referring to claim 4 the combination of Sivaramakrishnan et al, Adams et al, Nishizawa et al, and Tsuchimoto teaches a vacuum pump attached an exhaust port.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivaramakrishnan et al (US 5,879,574) in view of Adams et al (US 5,085,887) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Amano et al (US 5,948,485).

'Application/Contro umber: 09/835,498

Art Unit: 1765

The combination of Sivaramakrishnan et al, Adams et al, Nishizawa et al, and Tsuchimoto teaches all of the limitations of claim 2, except a grounding unit connected to the upper container and lower container to clean the inside of the chamber and a RF power generator connected to the susceptor to apply an RF power to the susceptor.

In an apparatus for plasma deposition, Amano et al teaches a plasma process apparatus includes a container 2 divided into two parts, a plasma chamber 21 and a reaction chamber 22, where the vacuum container 2 is grounded at zero potential. Amano et al also teaches aluminum stage 52 for use as a susceptor and the stage is connected with a radio-frequency power supply unit 61 for plasma lead-in through a blocking capacitor. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Sivaramakrishnan et al, Adams et al, Nishizawa et al, and Tsuchimoto with Amano's susceptor connected with a radio-frequency power supply because ions are confined to the target object on the susceptor (col 5, ln 1-10). Also it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Sivaramakrishnan et al, Adams et al, Nishizawa et al, and Tsuchimoto with Amano's grounded container because it protects the integrity of the chamber and the chamber circuitry from any static discharge or induced electrical currents that may build in or on the chamber.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yoder (US 5,281,274) teaches alternately and repeatedly introducing reactant gases associated flow controllers 64, 66 (col 7-8).

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J Song whose telephone number is 703-305-4953. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin L Utech can be reached on 703-308-3868. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Matthew J Song Examiner Art Unit 1765

MJS December 9, 2002

> BENJAMIN L. UTECH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700